



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/614,019

07/08/2003

Yo Taniguchi

520.42912X00

9504

20457

7590

05/04/2006

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873

EXAMINER

CHENG, JACQUELINE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3768

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/614,019

Applicant(s)

TANIGUCHI ET AL.

Examiner

Jacqueline Cheng

Art Unit

3768

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/18/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed on July 8, 2003 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Objections

2. Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 21 improperly invokes means plus function as required by 35 USC § 112, sixth paragraph. Claims state “means” instead of “means for”. Examiner has interpreted and examined the claim as a means plus function claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3768

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-12, 20 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,980,846 B2 (herein referred to as Hardy et al.) in view of US Patent No. 6,687,528 B2 (herein referred to as Gupta et al.). Hardy et al. discloses a method for acquiring image data from a subject with an MRI system. It is well known to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that an MRI system inherently comprises an RF coil for generating an RF magnetic field, a main static magnet (in which a subject is placed in) providing a static magnetic field, gradient coils (usually 3) to create magnetic field gradients and a controller to control the pulse sequences. In particular, Hardy et al. discloses an MRI system that acquires a reference data set of a region of interest, such as the motion of the heart or the heartbeat (col. 1 line 27-33), and then acquires a plurality of free-breathing data sets of this region of interest. The free-breathing data sets are then compared with the reference data set to be used in creating an image of the region of interest (col. 1 line 60-67).

In one embodiment of Hardy et al. it is disclosed that the reference data set is taken during a single breath-held time period (which could be either after inhaling or after exhaling) (col. 4 line 1-3). The comparison between the reference and free-breathing images are done through cross-correlations to decide which images should be kept and which are thrown away. If the feature of interest is present in any of the free-breathing images then the cross-correlation will reveal a strong central peak, if not, then the central peak will be offset. Even though Hardy et al. does not expressly disclose setting a threshold, to determine which images to reject there has to be some sort of threshold set. The amount of this threshold could be 1/m away from the 1,

Art Unit: 3768

m being greater than 2. Being closer to the 1.0 correlation (having a greater m value) would result in a more precise image reconstruction (col. 5 line 11-45).

Although this comparison is not done by using a similarity coefficient in particular, the results of the similarity coefficient and the cross-correlation are the same, the strong central peaks corresponding to the 1.0 correlations. Besides the fact that it would be obvious to use any sort of comparison method to obtain the proper images, Gupta et al. discloses using correlation coefficients to determine the proper images to use with a cut-off (R_{th}) of 0.95 (col. 50-55). It would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Gupta et al. with Hardy et al. as both inventions are related to MR imaging of moving organs and using ECG-gated scans to minimize noise.

As for the controller controlling the specific sequences claimed, a controller has control over the pulses, so therefore has control to create any sequence of pulse wanted.

5. **Claims 13-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardy et al. in view of Gupta et al., and further in view of US Patent No. 5,668,474 (herein referred to as Heid). Hardy et al. discloses most of the invention claimed as described above as well as performing Fourier transformation to obtain reconstructions of the images (col. 1 line 27-28, col. 2 line 58-61). It would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to perform a Fourier transform of any data that needs to be reconstructed into an image at no matter what point in the sequence.

What Hardy et al. does not disclose is the alternating polarity of the pulse sequence. Heid discloses a pulse sequence in which the readout magnetic field gradient and the phase-encoding

Art Unit: 3768

magnetic field has alternating polarities (figure 1-4, col. 1 line 47-65). It would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Heid with Hardy et al. and Gupta et al. as Heid discloses a pulse sequence for use in NMRI. Any pulse sequence can be applied to an MRI system, such as the MRI system of Hardy et al.


Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacqueline Cheng whose telephone number is 571-272-5596. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eleni Mantis-Mercader can be reached on 571-272-4740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JC


ELENI MANTIS-MERCADER
PRIMARY EXAMINER